

Dear editor,

We would like to thank the reviewer and the editors for the positive and constructive comments and suggestions, and we have revised our manuscript based on the comments.

Answers to reviewer

1. Would you please kindly correct all your minor typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript.

Answer: Thanks, and we have corrected all the typos and grammar errors in our manuscript.

2. Please, underline the novelty of the clinical case.

Answer: Thanks, and the novelty of the case has been added as the 'Core tip' section in the revised manuscript.

3. Do you have NT-proBNP data for your patient? The general suggestion is to characterize a heart failure properly. It must clear how much heart failure is related to hypoparathyroidism with more markers including Echo parameters and any functional examination. You have to provide clear and strong evidence of the association between the true manifestation of heart failure and hypoparathyroidism.

Answer: Thanks for the comment. NT-proBNP was not available, while BNP was 730pg/ml (0-100pg/ml). And the result has been

added into the manuscript.

4. Can you elaborate on the point of cataracts in your paper?

Answer: Thanks for the comment. Cataract is one of the clinical manifestations of hypocalcemia. To our best knowledge, there are a few reported cases of bilateral cataract secondary to hypocalcemia. The proposed mechanism of cataract formation in hypocalcemia is membrane damage with low calcium level in the aqueous humor and sodium content increase in the lens. In the case presented here, it is difficult to prove the relationship between cataracts and hypocalcemia, because no documents showed that the patient was free of cataracts before onset of hypocalcemia, and diabetes mellitus also contributes to the formation of cataract. The details have been explained in the manuscript.

5. Figures: you are focused on certain findings without clearance regarding the general situation - in both chest and skull. Please upgrade your figures respectively.

Answer: Thanks. The figures of chest and skull have been upgraded.

Re-review:

The peer reviewer 03846820 updated the re-review report as follow,

please revise the manuscript base on the comments and provide point-to-point response to the questions in 7 days: Scientific quality: Grade C: Good Language quality: Grade B: Minor language polishing Conclusion: [X] Minor revision Specific comments to authors: Dear authors, The raised criticism was mainly met. The case remains relatively poor in the description. I would strongly recommend you elaborate on the clinical content, maybe with short remarks. We can appreciate right now only some raw facts and general discussion without any transparent logic. The figures in the legends should have at least a couple of sentences with some explanations about what we see. It includes a straightforward methodology and some short remarks regarding what that is about.

Answer: Dear editor, Thank you very much for your comments. And we have re-arranged the content with short remarks and provided some explanations about the figures. The revised manuscript and image file are as attachments. We look forward to receiving your further comments about the case. Thank you very much. Best regards,
Yang Guo

Answers to editorial office's comments

1. The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures

using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Answer: Thanks. A PowerPoint file has been prepared as directed.

2. PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

Answer: Thanks. We have upgraded the references according to the guideline.

3. The “Case Presentation” section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Answer: Thanks a lot. The manuscript has been revised as instructed in the guidelines.

4. Author information

Answer: Thanks. The authors' information has been revised as instructed.

